



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,062	01/29/2001	Adrian P. Wise	94100414(EP)USC1X1C1D3 PD	8453
22887	7590	07/24/2006	EXAMINER NGUYEN, DUSTIN	
DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES 2265 E. 220TH STREET LONG BEACH, CA 90810			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 07/24/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/771,062	Applicant(s) WISE ET AL.	
	Examiner Dustin Nguyen	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 7 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 04/28/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. As per remarks, Applicants' argued, on the new amended claims 1 and 4, that (1) neither Horvath, Nukiyama nor Morrison, taken alone or in any combination, teach, suggest, or render obvious a parser, which prepares a pipeline for processing at one or more stages.
4. As to point (1), as rejected below in claims 1 and 4, Nukiyama discloses an invention related to a processing apparatus having a pipeline structure [Abstract], including a circuit [i.e. a parser] [col 2, lines 34-39] which can directly set data in any arbitrary pipeline latch [i.e. prepare a pipeline for processing at one or more stages] [col 2, lines 40-43; and col 9, lines 8-22].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2154

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvath et al. [US Patent No 5,450,599], in view of Nukiyama [US Patent No 4,658,354].

7. As per claim 1, Horvath discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a method of storing data, comprising:

receiving a sequence of data words of a first predetermined width [col 1, lines 15-25 and lines 37-41; and col 9, lines 32-34] and different respective formats either serially or in parallel [i.e. serial or sequential] [col 1, lines 15-19; col 1, lines 33-37; and col 10, lines 20-37];

splitting the data words of the received sequence to form new data words of a new sequence, the new data words having a second predetermined width [col 6, lines 63-col 7, lines 3; and col 7, lines 62-col 8, lines 2];

packing the new data words consecutively in a token buffer of a second width without holes between the new data words [col 8, lines 3-24]; and

unpacking the new data words to reproduce a new sequence of the new data words [claim 14].

Horvath does not specifically disclose

using said new data words in a pipeline, which includes a parser, a portion of said new data words capable of being used by said parser to prepare said pipeline for processing at one or more stages.

Nukiyama discloses

using said new data words in a pipeline [i.e. various commands and new data are generated in each pipeline stage, and these generated commands and new data are transferred through a pipeline bus to the latch of the next stage to be processed] [col 3, lines 47-53; and col 6, lines 59-63], which includes a parser [i.e. a circuit] [col 2, lines 34-39], a portion of said new data words capable of being used by said parser to prepare said pipeline for processing at one or more stages [i.e. a circuit which can directly set data in any arbitrary pipeline latch] [Figure 4; col 2, lines 35-43; and col 9, lines 10-25].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Horvath and Nukiyama because Nukiyama's teaching of selecting arbitrary pipeline stage would allow individual stage to independently process information [Nukiyama, Abstract].

8. As per claim 2, Horvath discloses writing a block of data from the token buffer to a random access memory device configured to store the words of the second width [col 8, lines 11-14; and col 13, lines 17-18].

9. As per claim 3, Horvath discloses expanding out run length code in the new words [col 6, lines 6-9; and col 7, lines 3-6].

10. As per claim 4, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Horvath discloses an inverse modeler, comprising:

a data unpacker to unpack data words received from an input terminal either serially or in parallel to a different length format [i.e. serial or sequential] [col 1, lines 15-19; col 6, lines 63-col 7, lines 3; and col 7, lines 62-col 8, lines 2];

a data expander coupled to the data unpacker [col 8, lines 3-24].

a data padder to pad data tokens received from the data expander [col 4, lines 10-12].

11. Claims 5 – 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvath et al. [US Patent No 5,450,599], in view of Nukiyama [US Patent No 4,658,354], and further in view of Morrison et al. [US Patent No 4,985,766].

12. As per claim 5, Horvath and Nukiyama do not specifically disclose the data expander expands out run length codes into runs of zero followed by a level in packed data. Morrison discloses the data expander expands out run length codes into runs of zero followed by a level in packed data [col 7, lines 40-54]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Horvath, Nukiyama and Morrison because Morrison's teaching would the fullness of the output buffer may be used to determine the quantisation factor [Morrison, col 1, lines 33-44].

Art Unit: 2154

13. As per claim 6, Morrison discloses the padder pads the last word of expanded tokens [col 2, lines 32-35; and col 4, lines 13-15].

14. As per claim 7, Morrison discloses the data unpacker deletes data between a flush signal and a block end signal [col 5, lines 1-47].

15. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Follansbee John can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2154


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100